



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GLEANINGS FROM THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

THE text of the prophetic writings appears to afford very little justification for the theory which regards them as representing "Notes of Discourses." The utterances of the prophets were, to a great extent, suggested by special inquiries, or particular occasions. Their style was, as a rule, concise, vigorous, pointed; it might be abundant, but seldom diffuse, and when most eloquent, then most symmetrical; neither requiring nor admitting abbreviation. Even the prophecies of Ezekiel, which approach more nearly to the nature of set discourses, afford by their very repetitions the best proof that they have not suffered abridgment. In a few passages of Jeremiah (*e.g.*, xxi. 11-14; xxv. 3, *seq.*; xxvi. 4-6; xxxiv. 21, 22; xxxvii. 17) we have something like a summary or recapitulation; but these passages tend rather to illustrate the originality of those from which they are derived. The prophets delivered oracles; they did not preach sermons.

This is the reality which underlies a second theory—Ewald's theory of "Fly-sheets." But what was the material aspect of these documents? The answer is not far to seek. When we recollect that the Ten Words are represented as inscribed on two tables of stone, and that Isaiah (viii. 1; cf. *v.* 16, and xxx. 8) and Habakkuk (ii. 2, 3), registered their predictions upon tablets, we are entitled to suppose that in many an unrecorded instance the uttered "Word of Jahveh" was thus preserved, circulated, and transmitted to posterity. The arrangement of the Decalogue, and other laws contained in the "Book of the Covenant," in pairs of pentads (*Addis, Documents of the Hexateuch*, Vol. I., p. 142. Cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*,

chap. vii., esp. pp. 260, 261), may point to the use of a diptych. Cf. Isaiah viii. 16, *sup. cit.*; Jer. xxxii. 10, 11, 14; and Maunde Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography*, chap. ii., esp. pp. 18, 20, 25.

The collected utterances of any prophet would thus exist, in the first instance, on a series of tablets, analogous, in some degree, to the Latin *caudex*. "Plurium tabularum contextus caudex apud antiquos vocabatur; unde publicæ tabulæ codices dicuntur." How easily might members of the series become detached, displaced or lost! On the back or margin of such tablets matter more or less cognate to their proper contents might subsequently be inscribed. Sooner or later the whole series would be copied into a roll (Jer. xxxvi.), the "leaves" or columns of the latter in some measure corresponding to the faces of the original tablets. How far, if at all, these divisions of the written text might coincide with elements of the subject-matter, units of rhythmical form, and so with the paragraphs of the modern version, I must leave it for others to determine; confining myself to the suggestion that in the hands of a skilled palæographer a measurement of the space occupied by component portions of the Hebrew text might sometimes prove a valuable aid to criticism, and afford a clue to the arrangement, or disorder, of the prophecies.

Isaiah, in his long lifetime, may well have put forth more than one collection of his utterances. It is at least a probable hypothesis that the earliest "Book of Isaiah" began with what is now chap. vi.; and that to this was originally prefixed the title, "The Vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem"; which with an editorial date now occupies chap. i. 1. When the later prologue replaced the earlier vision, the form of the title, we may suppose, was changed to that which now stands at the head of the second chapter.

According to Duhm (*apud* Cheyne, *JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, Vol. V., p. 298), the closing words of vi. 13 are an interpolation. And certainly the idea of "the holy seed"

belongs to the age of Ezra (Ezr. ix. 2), rather than to that of Isaiah. The prophet would never have attached holiness to heredity. He had no occasion to contrast Jew and Gentile. His mind was rather occupied with a moral distinction existing in Israel itself. But is any part of this verse genuine? One can understand a threat of extermination. And, on the other hand, we are familiar with the idea of "the remnant." But why predict, first its survival, and then its destruction, as in the former part of this verse? Is not this a *vaticinium ex eventu*, a reference to the misfortunes which befell the returned exiles? (Ezra iv., etc.; Neh. i. 3, and perhaps Zech. xiv.). And how can this beginning be reconciled with the sequel?

Isaiah vi. 1-12 should, I think, be followed immediately by vii. 18-25. Verses 1-17 of the latter chapter are derived from another source, possibly from "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" (2 Kings xvi. 19). In chap. viii. the prophet still speaks in his own person as far as v. 18, which is the natural conclusion of the section; but v. 19 should perhaps follow v. 15. It is possible that all which we have as yet considered should precede chap. ii. 6. It would seem from viii. 16-19 that there "was a famine of hearing the words of Jahveh" (Amos viii. 11), as in the last days of Saul (1 Sam. xxviii. 6). In chap. ii. 6 we have the reason.

Chap. viii. 20 is perhaps spurious, being in part based on v. 16, and in part serving as an artificial link to connect vv. 16-19 with vv. 21, 22. In regard to the latter, two things, and two things only, seem clear. They have no relation to the rest of chap. viii., but a very intimate one to chap. v. 30. I am led to the conclusion that the passage viii. 21-ix. 7 (in the English version) was at one time appended, by way of antithesis, to the eloquent termination of chap. v. If we observe that the first part of v. 30 is parallel to the preceding verse, and the second part to viii. 22, we shall be the more inclined to follow Dr. Siegfried and Canon Cheyne in transposing viii. 22 and 21.

Both verses appear to me to describe the sufferings and despair of a people carried into captivity.

Cheyne (J. Q. R., IV., 565) arranges the text in this order:—v. 1-24; ix. 7-20; v. 26-30. In Vol. V., p. 298, he quotes, with apparent approval, Duhm's observation that "v. 30 is a marginal gloss suggested by viii. 22." Let us, then, for v. 30, *substitute* viii. 22, followed by viii. 21, and this by ix. 1-7. Referring chaps. vi. 1-viii. 18, with the changes above indicated, to a position at the commencement of the book, the text from v. 1 to x. 4 will for the first time fall into a tolerable order; but, while there can be little doubt that x. 1-4 should be incorporated in chap. v., I regret the loss of v. 25 involved in the proposed arrangement, and I do not understand the necessity of removing ix. vv. 7-20 (8-21 Eng.) from their present place. But these verses need a climax? We have it in x. 5. The oracle which fills the latter part of chap. ix., when originally published, may very well have ended with the third occurrence of its menacing refrain. In that early book of Isaiah which we are trying to reconstruct, it served to prepare the way for the prophecy next to be discussed.

The section beginning at x. 5 has undergone both displacement and interpolation. The original order of the text may perhaps be restored approximately as follows:—x. 5-11, 12-15, 16-18 (33, 34), 19, 24-26; xvii. 12-14; x. 28-32; xiv. 24-27 (cf. Cheyne, J. Q. R., IV., 566; and on Duhm, V. 299). Chap. xiv. vv. 24, 25, explain why the invasion has been permitted which is so vividly described in x. 28-32. In chap. x. vv. 20-23 are very suspicious, and break the sequence of 5-19, 24-26. Verse 27 is, I think, spurious, and based on xiv. 25. The Messianic prophecy in xi. 1-9 is linked to that which precedes it by x. 33, 34, much in the same manner in which the similar utterance in ix. 1-7 is connected, as I suppose, with chap. v. by means of v. 30, viii. 22, and viii. 21. In neither case is the connection a strong one. In chap. x., vv. 33, 34 are almost certainly misplaced, while, besides these and the

passage under discussion, all that intervenes between x. 28-32 and its natural sequel in xiv. 24-27 is undoubtedly exilic and post-exilic.

Both ix. 1-7 and xi. 1-9 are, if I am not mistaken, the work of the same hand, whether or no it be the hand of Isaiah. The Divine names borne by the royal child in ix. 6 are *only* explicable in the light of xi. 2. These passages taken together do plainly describe, I will not say an incarnation, but at least an *avatar* (see Monier-Williams, *Hinduism*, S.P.C.K., p. 100 *seq.*, esp. 103 *ad fin.*; and compare the heroes of Israel with those of India, Jud. xiii. 25, etc.; 1 Sam. x. 6, xi. 7, *et sæpe*). One may be excused a protest against the pedantry which degrades "Father of Eternity" into "Giver of Booty," and couples such a title with "Prince of Peace."

But were these predictions the work of Isaiah? It is conceivable that the mind of the prophet should pass through the stage in which he and his own children, with their symbolic names, "are for signs and wonders from the LORD of hosts which dwelleth in Mount Zion," to the idea of a child, presumably of the house of David, whose birth and name should be a pledge of the protecting presence of Jahveh; and finally to the conception that such a child animated by his spirit should be destined to manifest the principles of his rule. It is also possible that this development came to pass more gradually, not in one but in a series of minds. It cannot be denied that the words of ix. 1 (cf. Ps. lxviii. 27), "In the former time . . . Galilee of the nations," suggest a period later than that of Isaiah. Both the passages under discussion offer a curious contrast to ch. iii. 4, 12. In the first instance these ideal hopes may have been associated with the child Josiah, who at eight years of age was called to the throne by a popular movement, who ten years later became the agent of a prophetic Reformation, and who at least attempted to assert in some degree his authority over the former Northern Kingdom. (I may be allowed to refer to

what I have written on this subject, in defence of the genuineness of Jer. iii. 6-15, J. Q. R., VI. 278, 279.) But if Duhm be right in tracing allusions to ix. 1-6 (Heb.) in xxvi. 15*a* and xxxiii. 23 (J. Q. R., V. 298), and if we bear in mind Cheyne's significant remark on ix. 6 (*Last Words on Isaiah*), "Such an elaborate sentence-name as Luzzatto supposes would not be natural in Isaiah's time, though it might be in that of the writer of Chronicles," the possibility of a much later date ought not to be excluded from our view.

I have previously suggested that xi. 1-9 should be followed by ii. 2-4. The words which form the commencement of that noble passage "nowhere else occur at the beginning of a prophecy." Nor can I find anywhere a position more appropriate than that above indicated. Note especially the connection between "my holy mountain" in xi. 9 and "the mountain of the LORD's house" in ii. 2, 3 *a*; between xi. 3, 4 and ii. 3 *b*, 4 *a*; between xi. 6-9 and ii. 4 *b*, *c*. The two passages are in a great measure parallel. It does not necessarily follow that both are of the same date. But did they stand in juxtaposition, who would think of separating them? It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that both, and perhaps also ix. 1-7, are alike post-exilic.

The last section of ch. xi., especially vv. 11, 15, 16, agrees with the end of ch. xix. (23-25) and that of ch. xxvii. (12, 13), in the parallelism between Egypt and Assyria, which in xi. and xxvii. are regarded as places of exile whence Jahveh should recover the "remnant of his people," the "outcasts of Israel," the "dispersed of Judah" (xi. 11, 12; cp. xxvii. 12, 13). In the former passage we may note, beside the Deutero-Isaianic touch of the *highway* in v. 16 (cp. xix. 23), the drought threatened to Nile and Euphrates (cp. xix., 5-8, and Jer. l. 38). In ch. xxvii., 12, 13, the "flood of the River," and the "brook of Egypt" are merely put for the regions of which they formed the boundaries. The concluding reference to "the holy mountain at Jerusalem," reminds one of xi. 9, and ii. 2, 3.

In the latter part of ch. xix., Egypt and Assyria appear in a new and strange light, associated with the people of Jahveh. This result appears to be reached by a series of steps, which may be traced from *v.* 16 onwards. Whoever will explain the allusions in xliii. 3, 4, and xlv. 14, will also enable us to understand those in xix. 16, 17, 20, and perhaps in xviii. 7, with which should be compared Zeph. iii. 10. May we suppose that all these passages belong to the age of Cyrus?

Even at an earlier period, as we know from Jer. xl. 7 *seq.* (see esp. xliii. 5-7, 13, xlv. 1, 15, xlv. 14), there existed in Egypt a numerous colony of Jewish refugees. We know the places of their settlement; Migdol, Tahpanhes, Noph, and the country of Pathros (cf. Is. xi. 13); perhaps also Bethshemesh (cf. Isa. xix. 18). We are informed of the nature of their religion. It was that which characterised the mass of Jeremiah's contemporaries; a cultus of Jahveh which did not exclude the traditional and popular worship of the Queen of Heaven. Far less was it likely to acknowledge the restrictions of Deuteronomy. Under these circumstances the erection of altar and pillar to Jahveh in Egypt (Is. xix. 19) was probably a matter of course, unless indeed we are meant to understand that hereafter the obelisks of Heliopolis should be dedicated to the God of Israel. But this settlement contained within it at its origin a germ of better things: the influence of Jeremiah and his disciple Baruch. At a later period, it may be supposed, prophetic sanction for the sacrificial worship of Jahveh in exile, was devised in the passage before us, and justified by the hope of conversion for Egypt and Assyria. In this connection, Ps. lxviii. 31 should also be compared.

It may be worth while to note that the genuineness of the reference to Asherim and Sun-images, which has been thought to imply a pre-exilic date for xxvii. 9, appears to be as doubtful as that of a similar clause in xvii. 8. Both may be due to the hand of a later student of the text (cf. 2 Chr. xiv. 5, xvii. 6). Isaiah xvii. 6 also presents a

suspicious resemblance to vi. 13 and xxvii. 12. That xi. 10 is merely a gloss has been formerly suggested (J. Q. R., V., 348). Chap. xii. may, with considerable probability, be ascribed to the writer of the very similar passages in xxiv.-xxvi. Chap. xiii. 1 belongs to a group of unauthentic and inappropriate titles which are only important as marking a stage in the history of the book. It is very remarkable that with this sole exception, we have, as yet, met with no express reference to Babylon. Nor in chap. xiii. 2-13—a description of the day of Jahveh, which exhibits a certain resemblance to the commencement of chap. xxiv., and a closer analogy to xxxiv.—is Babylon ever mentioned. After verse 13 follows, not a transition, but a complete *hiatus*. In the first part of the chapter the execution of Jahveh's judgment is still future. In verse 14, Babylon is already fallen. But nowhere is its fall described. Either an important passage is lost, or the text is wrongly arranged. As it stands, we are left to conjecture the subject of verse 14.

This group of prophecies might perhaps be arranged as follows:—xii., xiv. 1-21, xiii. 14-22, xiii. 2-13. The concluding verses of chap. xiv. are parallel to xiii. 14-22, and might be omitted without much loss. Both passages offer points of contact with chap. xxxiv.

It is with some hesitation that I suggest a more startling alternative, which yet in an investigation of possibilities should not be altogether overlooked, namely, that the two parts of Isaiah xiii. might serve as prologue and epilogue to the great prophecy against Babylon contained in Jer. l., li., with which, beyond all question, they are very closely connected. (It is not safe to *assume* the priority of Isaiah xiii.). On this hypothesis the first part of the chapter in Isaiah (xiii. 2-13) would be followed by Jer. l. 2; the second part (*vv.* 14-22) would be attached to the proper conclusion of Jer. li. 44 ("and the nations shall not flow together any more unto him"), thus supplying a subject to *v.* 14 (cf. Jer. li. 6-9). I need not repeat what I have said in *Studies in the Book of Jeremiah*, on chaps. l., li.

It is, however, natural to compare Isaiah xiv. 1, 2 with Jer. l. 4-7, 17-20, etc. But there is at least one noteworthy difference. The passages in Jer. l. are marked by the parallelism of Israel and Judah. Isaiah xiv., *vv.* 1, 2, agree with chap. xl. *seq.*, in that of Israel and Jacob. Nor is there anything in Jer. l., li., like the prediction in Isaiah xiv. 1b (cf. lvi. 36). On the whole, the commencement of Isaiah xiv., unlike the preceding chapter, is related to the Second Isaiah rather than the Second Jeremiah.

Gathering here and there gleanings from the wide field in which so many able reapers are at work, I would suggest that in xxiv., verses 13-16 should be transferred to the end of the chapter, where they would afford a natural transition to xxv. At the close of xxxiii. the greater part of v. 21 ("But in the place of broad rivers and streams [*scilicet* Babylon] there shall go," etc.), and the whole of verse 23 appear to me interpolated in an earlier text. One of the easiest and greatest improvements in the arrangement of the book would be the simple omission of chapters xxxvi.-xxxix. The variations from the text of Kings should be noted in that book, and the Psalm of Hezekiah printed as an appendix to it. The result of this change would be to bring Isa. xxxv. into immediate juxtaposition with chap. xl., to which it is so intimately related. More than one place might be found for it in the great prophecy of Israel's restoration. We need only recognise that it is properly an integral part of that work, from which it has unfortunately become detached. Another passage in the same case may be found, as I have formerly pointed out, in lxvi. 7-13. But I omitted to notice its most interesting feature. It describes the first arrival at Jerusalem of the returned exiles, among whom was, in all probability, the Evangelical Prophet himself. It might fitly be assigned to a position following chap. xlix., and if the prophecies of the Second Isaiah were arranged in chronological sequence, it should mark the point of transition from the Babylonian to the Palestinian chapters. (See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., 315).

After l. 1-3 there is an evident *hiatus*, and a new section commences at verse 4. A more natural sequel may be found in chap. lix., which begins with a reply to the question asked in l. 2.

I do not know whether the fluctuating conception of the Servant of Jahveh has ever been illustrated from that of Piers Plowman. Professor Skeat, according to a review of his edition in the *Academy* for January 29th, 1887, by Mr. Henry Bradley, says that, in the early part of the poem, Piers "is a blameless ploughman, and a guide to men who are seeking the shrine of Truth"; afterwards he is Jesus Christ; and, later still, he "denotes the whole Christian body." And then the reviewer proceeds to criticise and explain the seeming confusion, with the saying that Piers represents "the ideal humanity." May we say in like manner that the Servant of Jahveh now represents the actual, and now the ideal Israel; not exactly the pious "kernel of the nation," but rather the nation viewed in its ideal aspect, its religious character, its prophetic destiny; and so also represents at times the individual prophet, and, at times, the ideal of the office which he is called upon to fulfil? Between these four conceptions there is no necessary inconsistency; rather they serve to supplement and correct each other.

As the whole great prophecy has a distinct exordium in chap. xl, so it has an appropriate close in chap. lxii. But the actual termination (lxii. 12), though admitting comparison with that of Ezek. xlviii., is not quite so effective; and the magnificent fragment which follows (lxiii. 1-6) is evidently separated from its proper context. Happily these defects allow a complete remedy. Chap. lxiii., vv. 1-6, which, as Graetz points out (*J. Q. R.*, IV. p. 6), bear no especial reference to Edom, should simply change places with lix. 19-21. The last clause of lix. 18 is an obvious editorial addition, intended to supply a link between vv. 18 and 19. The close relation between lix. 15 *b*-18 *a* and lxiii. 1-6 is indisputable. The originality and the correct

position of lix. 19, 20 may be open to doubt. But when once indicated, it can hardly, I think, be questioned, that in lix. 21 we have the fitting conclusion of the entire prophecy, the final promise of Jahveh to Israel. In a sense it has been fulfilled.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

Note on the order of the text in Hosea i.-iii.

I wish to supplement what I have previously said upon this subject (J. Q. R., VI. 298) by the further suggestion that chap. iii. should itself be transferred to a position immediately following i. 9. There is no doubt that chap. i. should terminate at this point; and there is clearly a break between the narrative which thus concludes, and the pleading which begins at ii. 2 (Eng.). On the other hand, the second narrative (in chap. iii.) would follow naturally at the end of the first; while, as the text now stands, I think every reader must have felt a sense of bathos in turning from chap. ii. to chap. iii. And in this way the position of the three verses which stand after i. 9, can be accounted for consistently with the hypothesis previously suggested, that with two exceptions (i. 10 *b* and ii. 1, Eng.) they should follow chap. iii.; the two exceptions being glosses on i. 9.

It may be proper to add (March, 1895) that the foregoing *Gleanings from the Book of Isaiah*, as well as *Studies in the Book of Jeremiah*, were written in the opening months of 1894, so that I had not the opportunity of consulting any more recent work. With regard to Is. xl, I have ventured to put a query, which still remains unanswered, in *The Academy*, for February 2nd, 1895 (p. 105, col. 3).